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**Example of a Case-Study Evaluation Rubric**

**Scenario**: The School of Management at the International Academy of Commerce and Business Enterprise offers a Bachelor of Business Administration. The school has identified the following intended student learning outcomes (ISLOs) for the program:

1. Students will be able to identify the principal concepts, theories, and practices in the functional areas of business. (*Business Functional Areas*)
2. Students will be able to identify the relevant theories and principles associated with the economic environment of business. (*Economic Environment*)
3. Students will be able to evaluate legal and ethical principles in business and apply them to organizational decision making. (*Legal/Ethical Principles*)
4. Students will be able to apply business-related decision-support tools to the formulation of management decisions. (*Decision-Support Tools*)
5. Students will be able to recognize and describe the global dimensions of business. (*Global Dimensions*)
6. Students will be able to construct coherent written forms of communication. (*Written Communication Skills*)
7. Students will be able to compose and present effective oral forms of communication. (*Oral Communication Skills*)
8. Students will be able to demonstrate analytical and critical-thinking skills in the context of organizational decision making. (*Analytical/Critical-Thinking Skills*)
9. Students will be able to identify and explain the interrelationships between business and its social and natural environments and to apply them in a managerial context. *(Social Responsibility/Sustainability*)
10. Students will be able to integrate theory and practice in the business functional areas in the analysis of organizational problems and challenges. (*Integration Skills*)

In order to assess these intended learning outcomes, the School of Management is using a comprehensive end-of-program examination as one of its direct measures of student learning. The examination is used to assess intended outcomes #1–#5. The school’s second direct measure of student learning is a comprehensive case-study that is administered in the capstone course. The case-study is used to assess intended outcomes #5–#10.

The evaluation rubric below can be used both for assigning a grade or mark to the case-study in the capstone course and for the purpose of program-level assessment based on the case-study, i.e., for assessing the programmatic intended student learning outcomes in the BBA.

**International Academy of Commerce and Business Enterprise**

**School of Management**

**Comprehensive Case-Study**

**Evaluation Rubric**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Student: |  |
| Evaluator: |  |
| Date: |  |

For each of the case analysis component areas (evaluation dimensions) identified below, use the evaluation rubric to assess the student’s work by specifying a score based on the performance ratings and descriptors delineated in the rubric form and supplying relevant comments in the space provided.

**Identification of Issues**: This section should describe the managerial, financial, marketing, legal, ethical, economic, international, and social responsibility/sustainability issues relevant to the case. The section should also include an executive summary that provides an overview of the key issues and problems that are central to the case.

**Stakeholder Perspectives**: This section should identify the key stakeholders in the case, and describe and evaluate their differing perspectives and interests.

**Connections to Theoretical and Empirical Research**: This section should describe the ways in which theoretical and empirical research are related and can be applied to the central issues and problems in the case.

**Analysis and Evaluation**: This section should present an analysis of the central issues and problems in the case. This analysis should be informed by relevant theory and empirical data and should lead to a set of conclusions that are supported by appropriate evidence.

**Action Plans**: This section should present plans of action for dealing with the central issues and problems in the case. These action plans should flow from the previous analysis and evaluation and should be appropriately justified.

**Evaluation of Consequences**: This section should provide a description and analysis of the expected results from implementing the proposed plans of action as previously specified.

|  |
| --- |
| **Case-Study Grading Rubric** |
| **Evaluation****Dimensions** | **Performance Rating** | **Score** |
| **Beginning** | **Competent** | **Accomplished** |
| **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** |
| **Case-Study Component Areas – Grading Criteria** |
| **Identification of Issues** | Does not recognize the problems or issues of the case, or identifies problems and issues that are not based on facts of the case; displays little understanding of the issues, key problems, and the company’s present situation and strategic challenges; executive summary does not present a clear overview of the case issues; main points are not outlined, or cannot be understood | With a few exceptions, identifies and outlines the principal problems and issues in the case; demonstrates an acceptable understanding of the company’s issues, current situation, and strategic challenges; executive summary provides an adequate overview of the case issues and problems; summary is missing a few minor points, but meets expectations | Presents accurate and detailed descriptions of the problems and issues central to the case; provides a well-focused diagnosis of strategic issues and key problems that demonstrates an excellent grasp of the company’s present situation and strategic challenges; descriptions are compelling and insightful; provides a thorough and effective executive summary |  |
| **Comments**:  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Case-Study Grading Rubric** |
| **Evaluation****Dimensions** | **Performance Rating** | **Score** |
| **Beginning** | **Competent** | **Accomplished** |
| **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** |
| **Case-Study Component Areas – Grading Criteria** |
| **Stakeholder Perspectives** | Does not identify or explain the perspectives of any stakeholders involved in the case, or explanation is flawed in many respects; fails to recognize any differences between the interests of the various stakeholders | With a few minor exceptions, adequately identifies and summarizes the perspectives of the principal stakeholders involved in the case; outlines some conflicts of interest between company stakeholders | Clearly and accurately describes the unique perspectives of multiple key stakeholders in the case; demonstrates insightful analysis of strategic tensions or conflicts of interest between the stakeholders |  |
| **Comments**:  |
| **Connections to Theoretical and Empirical Research** | Makes little or no connection between the issues and problems in the case and relevant theoretical and empirical research, or the connections identified are weak or inaccurate in many respects | Identifies and outlines connections between some of the issues and problems in the case and relevant theoretical and empirical research; the connections identified are adequately elucidated | Makes appropriate, insightful, and powerful connections between the issues and problems in the case and relevant theory and empirical data; effectively integrates multiple sources of knowledge with case information |  |
| **Comments**:  |
| **Analysis and Evaluation** | Simply repeats facts identified in the case and does not discuss the relevance of these facts; fails to draw conclusions, or conclusions are not justified or supported; does not present relevant research or data; shows no critical examination of case issues | Provides an acceptable analysis of most of the issues and problems in the case; in most instances, analysis is adequately supported by theory and empirical data; appropriate conclusions are outlined and summarized | Presents a balanced, in-depth, and critical assessment of the facts of the case in light of relevant empirical and theoretical research; develops insightful and well-supported conclusions using reasoned, sound, and informed judgments |  |
| **Comments**:  |
| **Action Plans** | Has difficulty identifying alternatives and appropriate courses of action; few if any alternatives are presented, infeasible actions are proposed, action plans are not supported, or actions do not address the key issues and problems in the case | Outlines and summarizes some alternative courses of action to deal with most of the issues and problems in the case; in most instances, proposed action plans are outlined, are feasible, and based on relatively sound theory and evidence | Effectively weighs and assesses a variety of alternative actions that address the multiple issues central to the case; proposes detailed plans of action; action plans are realistic and contain thorough and well-reasoned justifications |  |
| **Comments**:  |
| **Evaluation of Consequences** | Displays limited awareness and/or understanding of the consequences of action plans; fails to identify implications and consequences of proposed action plans; identified outcomes do not follow from proposed action plans, or outcomes are not related to issues in the case | Demonstrates acceptable analysis of the results of proposed action plans; adequately outlines and summarizes the implications and consequences resulting from alternative courses of action; with a few minor exceptions, identified consequences of action plans are related to key issues in the case  | Objectively and critically reflects upon alternative plans of action; effectively identifies, thoroughly discusses, and insightfully evaluates the implications and consequences resulting from the proposed action plans; identified consequences are tied to the key issues central to the case |  |
| **Comments**:  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Overall Performance Rating on Case-Study Analysis** |
| **Evaluation Criteria** | **Score** |
| Identification of Issues |  |
| Stakeholder Perspectives |  |
| Connections to Theoretical and Empirical Research |  |
| Analysis and Evaluation |  |
| Action Plans |  |
| Evaluation of Consequences |  |
| **Total Score** |  |

For the purpose of program-level assessment, the School of Management Studies has identified several learning outcomes that it expects students to have achieved upon graduation from the BBA program.

For each of the intended student learning outcomes (ISLOs) identified below and based on student performance on the case analysis, use the evaluation rubric to assess the extent to which the student achieved that outcome by specifying a score based on the performance ratings and descriptors delineated in the rubric form and supplying relevant comments in the space provided.

**Global Dimensions**: Students will be able to recognize and describe the global dimensions of business.

**Written Communication Skills**: Students will be able to construct coherent written forms of communication.

**Oral Communication Skills**: Students will be able to compose and present effective oral forms of communication.

**Analytical/Critical-Thinking Skills**: Students will be able to demonstrate analytical and critical-thinking skills in the context of organizational decision making.

**Social Responsibility/Sustainability**: Students will be able to identify and explain the interrelationships between business and its social and natural environments and to apply them in a managerial context.

**Integration Skills**: Students will be able to integrate theory and practice in the business functional areas in the analysis of organizational problems and challenges.

|  |
| --- |
| **Case-Study Program-Level Assessment Rubric** |
| **Evaluation****Dimensions** | **Performance Rating** | **Score** |
| **Beginning** | **Competent** | **Accomplished** |
| **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** |
| **Programmatic Evaluation – Program-Level Assessment Criteria (ISLOs)** |
| **Global Dimensions** | Case analysis demonstrates only rudimentary or superficial knowledge of the international/global dimensions of business; provides little if any description of the relevant global factors in the case analysis, or description is erroneous; case analysis fails to recognize all or most of the relevant economic, cultural, financial, political, legal, ethical, demographic, and managerial issues and differences that affect the company, or does not specify their impacts in the case-study component areas | Case analysis displays satisfactory knowledge of the international/global dimensions of business; case analysis outlines relevant global factors in the context of the case-study component areas, but is missing a few minor elements; provides an adequate description of most of the relevant economic, cultural, financial, political, legal, ethical, demographic, and managerial issues and differences, but only summarizes or outlines their effects on the company in the case-study component areas | Case analysis demonstrates in-depth knowledge of the international/global dimensions of business; effectively identifies and describes the relevant global factors and elements in the analysis of case issues; provides a thorough description of the relevant economic, cultural, financial, political, legal, ethical, demographic, and managerial issues and differences that affect the company, and presents a detailed explanation of their impacts in the case-study component areas |  |
| **Comments**:  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Case-Study Program-Level Assessment Rubric** |
| **Evaluation****Dimensions** | **Performance Rating** | **Score** |
| **Beginning** | **Competent** | **Accomplished** |
| **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** |
| **Programmatic Evaluation – Program-Level Assessment Criteria (ISLOs)** |
| **Written Communication Skills** | Displays inadequate organization and/or development making the case analysis difficult to follow; the written case analysis exhibits multiple errors in grammar, sentence structure, and/or spelling; unacceptable writing skills (e.g., weaknesses in language facility and mechanics) hinder readability and contribute to an ineffective case analysis | Case analysis evidences satisfactory organization and development; the case analysis is readable and easy to follow with only a few lapses; uses good language conventions and mechanics with a few minor errors in spelling, grammar, sentence structure, and/or punctuation; case analysis meets expectations in this area | Effective organization and development contribute to full comprehension of written case analysis; readability is enhanced by facility in language use, excellent mechanics, and syntactic variety; uses language conventions effectively (e.g., spelling, punctuation, sentence structure, paragraphing, grammar, etc.) |  |
| **Comments**:  |
| **Oral Communication Skills** | Presentation cannot be understood because there is no logical sequencing of information; presenter uses superfluous graphics or no graphics; graphics do not support or relate to issues presented; presenter reads most or all of the case analysis with little or no eye contact; presenter mumbles, incorrectly pronounces terms, and/or speaks too quietly; presentation rambles, is unclear, and cannot be followed by the audience; presenter is unprofessional, lacks confidence, is uncomfortable, and cannot answer basic questions | Case analysis is presented in a sequence that the audience can follow; graphics support and are related to the components of the case analysis; presenter maintains eye contact with the audience with a few minor exceptions; presenter reads from notes on a few occasions; presenter uses good voice dynamics and clearly enunciates terms; presenter is comfortable for the most part and adequately answers questions; overall, the presentation is delivered in a satisfactory manner and meets expectations with respect to oral communication skills | Case analysis is presented in a logical, interesting, and effective sequence, which the audience can easily follow; presentation uses effective graphics to explain and reinforce the information presented; presenter maintains eye contact with audience, seldom returning to notes; presenter speaks in a clear voice and uses correct, precise pronunciation of terms; presentation is thorough, clear, compelling, informative, and professionally delivered; presenter is professional,confident, comfortable, and answers questions effectively |  |
| **Comments**:  |
| **Analytical/****Critical Thinking Skills** | Information presented in the case-study component areas is often inaccurate or incomplete; presents little if any analysis in the component areas; inaccurately and/or inappropriately applies procedures, formulas, or principles; presents few solutions, alternatives, or strategies in the relevant case-study component areas; solutions, alternatives, or strategies are often inaccurate or inconsistent; ideas are presented in a vague or rudimentary manner | Adequately presents information relating to most case-study component areas with only minor inconsistencies, irrelevancies, or omissions; applies appropriate procedures, formulas, or principles with a few minor inaccuracies; outlines solutions, alternatives, or strategies in the relevant case-study component areas that are logical and consistent with the evidence; develops solutions, alternatives, or strategies in a clear manner | Accurately and appropriately analyzes and interprets relevant information pertaining to each case-study component area; effectively applies appropriate procedures, formulas, and/or principles in developing and justifying multiple solutions, alternatives, or strategies in the relevant case-study component areas; solutions, alternatives, or strategies are clear, coherent, well supported, logically consistent, and complete |  |
| **Comments**:  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Case-Study Program-Level Assessment Rubric** |
| **Evaluation****Dimensions** | **Performance Rating** | **Score** |
| **Beginning** | **Competent** | **Accomplished** |
| **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** |
| **Programmatic Evaluation – Program-Level Assessment Criteria (ISLOs)** |
| **Social Responsibility/****Sustainability** | Displays only a limited ability to recognize and elucidate the connections between business and its social and natural environments; provides incomplete or inadequate explanations of how these connections can be operationalized in the management of organizations; analyses are not provided or are incomplete in significant respects; socially-responsible and sustainable business practices are not included in the development of organizational strategy or are only briefly mentioned; shows limited application to the analysis of the case-study | Case analysis identifies linkages between business and its social and natural environments with a few minor omissions; presents appropriate analyses of these linkages in the context of the case-study; provides a description of the ways in which the linkages can be managerially operationalized; identifies and describes socially-responsible and sustainable business practices; evidences an ability to apply these practices to the analysis of the case-study; overall the case analysis meets expectations with respect to the application of social responsibility and sustainability principles | Evidences a well-developed ability to recognize, elucidate, and comprehensively analyze the connections between business and its social and natural environments; clearly and thoroughly explains the ways in which these connections can be operationalized for the purpose of effective organizational management; demonstrates an advanced ability to incorporate socially-responsible and sustainable business practices in the development of organizational strategy and action plans; effectively applies these abilities in the analysis of the case-study |  |
| **Comments**:  |
| **Integration Skills** | Shows little or no ability to employ theory and practice in the functional areas of business in the assessment of problems and issues in the case-study; does not recognize or correctly identify cross-functional organizational issues relevant to the case-study; the case analysis does not identify or adequately evaluate organizational problems and challenges in light of relevant principles, theories, and practices in the functional areas of business; no strategic recommendations or conclusions are presented in the case analysis, or recommendations and conclusions are not appropriately justified or supported | Exhibits satisfactory application of principles, theories, and practices in the functional areas of business to the analysis of the case-study; with a few minor exceptions, the case analysis outlines and describes some cross-functional organizational issues that are relevant to the development of organizational strategy; the case analysis adequately identifies relevant organizational problems and challenges, and lists strategic recommendations and conclusions for action that are, for the most part, based on appropriate principles and concepts in the functional areas of business | Demonstrates well-developed ability to integrate and apply principles, theories, and practices in the functional areas of business to the analysis of issues in the case-study; effectively identifies, examines, and analyzes important cross-functional organizational issues that are important in the analysis of the case-study component areas; identifies and critically evaluates and assesses key organizational problems and challenges, and clearly justifies strategic recommendations and conclusions for action based on strong analytics and appropriate principles in the business functional areas |  |
| **Comments**:  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Summary Performance Ratings on Programmatic ISLOs** |
| **ISLOs/Program-Level Assessment Criteria** | **Score** |
| Global Dimensions |  |
| Written Communication Skills |  |
| Oral Communication Skills |  |
| Analytical/Critical-Thinking Skills |  |
| Social Responsibility/Sustainability |  |
| Integration Skills |  |